AGENCY ESTIMATE

OF THE FISCAL IMPACT OF IMPLEMENTING

HB 98 2011 General Session

Capital Outlay Funding Modifications

Sponsor: Representative Christine F. Watkins Lead Analyst: Ben Leishman

Agency Contact: Cathy Dudley/February 2, 2011 Title: MSP Budget and Property Tax Specialist
Agency Utah State Office of Education Office: 801-538-7667 Cell: 801-707-0848

A. Short Form (For bills that have not if you can check all five boxes to the right, you're almost done. If the bill obviously doesn't have an impact, you're done.	t done. There is no fiscal impact on local governments.			
If it isn't so obvious, explain what's going on. The most usual explanation is the codification of existing practices.	If necessary, explain why this bill has no fiscal impact.			
Attachments welcome.				
B. What parts of the bill cause fiscal impact?				
r	mout impact.			
Cite specific sections or line numbers.	Lines 77-83.			
Cite specific sections or line	*			
Cite specific sections or line	*			
Cite specific sections or line	Lines 77-83. propriation? For multiple appropriations			

D. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Explain the fiscal impact in plain English, detailing your assumptions, methods, & calculations.

List all direct costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what this \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

This bill does two things:

- (1) It limits the spending of a maximum of 0.0002 per dollar of taxable value of the local school board's annual capital outlay levy for the maintenance of school facilities in the school district to those local school boards with an enrollment of 2,500 students or more; and
- (2) For those school districts with an enrollment of fewer than 2,500 students, they may use the proceeds of the capital outlay levy for expenditures made within the accounting function classification, 2600 Operation and Maintenance of Plant Services, excluding expenditures for mobile phone service and vehicle operation and maintenance.

These changes could create some accounting variances because the uses would be so different between the small and large school districts.

E. REVENUES Select Fund Total	Current Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013	
1000				
F. COSTS by FUND Select Fund	Current Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013	
Total	0	0	0	
G. COSTS by EXPENI Expenses by Category Personal Services Travel	OITURE CATEGOR Current Budget Year FY 2011	CY. Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013	
Current Expense DP Current Expense DP Capital Outlay Capital Outlay Other/Pass Thru Total	0	0	0	
H. Non-State Impacts Your estimate of how will the bill affect:				
Local Governments These changes wouldn't directly have an impact on funding, but the changes could encourage the rural, smaller districts to increase their capital levies without the approval of the public (the Truth In Taxation process) to use the funds. In addition,				
Businesses with the increase in the capital outlay levy rates, these smaller districts could see an increase in the state Capital Outlay Foundation Growth funds which are partially based on a district's total combined capital outlay levy rates.				
If a school district raises the capital outlay levy, businesses would see an increase in				

their property taxes.

If a school district raises the capital outlay levy, individuals would see an increase in their property taxes.

This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future.

Individuals

2010 Version 11.09

Attachments welcome.